



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,409	06/05/2001	Markus H. Frank	81994/279322	1825

909 7590 05/07/2002  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

DAVIS, NATALIE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/873,409

Applicant(s)

FRANK ET AL.

Examiner

Natalie A. Davis

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 8 and 10-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                      6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III, claims 5-7 and 9 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 5-7 and 9 are being examined as belonging to the elected Group III, while claims 1-4, 8, and 10-17 are withdrawn from examination as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a non-elected claim and must be rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the non-elected claim and any intervening claims.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites "substantially pure." This is indefinite as it is unclear as to what level of purity is indicative of substantial.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized in *Ex parte* Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). They include the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the amount of direction or guidance disclosed in the specification, the presence or absence of working examples, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation which would be required in order to practice the invention as claimed.

The nature of the invention is to polynucleotides derived from SEQ ID NO: 1-8, consisting essentially of SEQ ID NO: 9-16. The polynucleotides are derivatives of the peptides of claim 2 and encompasses any polynucleotide of the claimed sequence with an unlimited number of additional sequences. This includes a whole universe of molecules that that may or may not perform the same biological functions and the specification does not give any guidance to which derivative or molecules consisting essentially of these polynucleotides will exhibit the biological activities as the claimed. Thus, it would be an undue burden to one of ordinary skill in the art to assay for claimed sequences, which are capable of functioning as contemplated. One cannot extrapolate the teachings of the specification to the breadth of the claims because the claims are broadly drawn to any polynucleotides derived from SEQ ID NO: 1-8, consisting essentially of SEQ ID NO: 9-16 and applicant has not enabled all of these molecules because applicant has not been shown that these polynucleotides are capable of functioning as that which is being disclosed.

Protein chemistry is probably one of the most unpredictable areas of biotechnology. For example, conservative replacement of a single "lysine" residue at position 118 of acidic fibroblast growth factor by "glutamic acid" led to the substantial loss of heparin binding, receptor binding and biological activity of the protein (Burgess et al., J of Cell Bio. 111:2129-2138, 1990). In transforming growth factor alpha, replacement of aspartic acid at position 47 with alanine or asparagine did not affect biological activity while replacement with serine or glutamic acid sharply reduced the biological activity of the mitogen (Lazar et al. Molecular and Cellular Biology 8:1247-1252, 1988). These references demonstrate that even a single amino

Art Unit: 1642

acid substitution or what appears to be an inconsequential chemical modification will often dramatically affect the biological activity and characteristic of a protein. Furthermore, the specification fails to teach what deletions, truncations, substitutions and mutations of the disclosed sequence can be tolerated that will allow the protein to function as claimed. While it is known that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the position within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with reasonable expectation of success are limited. Certain positions in the sequence are critical to the three-dimensional structure/function relationship, and these regions can tolerate only conservative substitutions or no substitutions. Residues that are directly involved in protein functions such as binding will certainly be among the most conserved (Bowie et al. Science, 247:1306-1310, 1990, p. 1306, col.2). Reasonable correlation must exist between the breadth of the claims and enablement set forth, and it cannot be predicted how to select and use any and all polynucleotides consisting essentially of SEQ ID NO: 9-16, which encode proteins consisting essentially of SEQ ID NO: 1-8. Therefore, in view of the lack of predictability of the prior art, the breadth of the claims and the absence of working examples, it would require undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to practice the invention as claimed. The rejection may be overcome if the claim were to indicate what biological function the polynucleotide must possess.

7. Claims 5-7 are rejected less than 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The instant specification does not contain a written description of the invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms or in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar* (CA FC) 19 USPQ2d 1111 (6/7/1991) clearly states that "written description" of invention required by first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is separate and distinct from that paragraph's requirement of enabling disclosure, since description must do more than merely provide explanation of how to "make and use" invention; applicant must also

Art Unit: 1642

convey, with reasonable clarity to those skilled in art, that applicant, as of filing date sought, was in possession of invention, with invention being, for purposes of "written description" inquiry, whatever is presently claimed. An applicant shows possession by describing the claimed invention with all its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, diagrams, and formulas. Also, description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing the invention was "ready for patenting," or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing.

The nature of the invention is to a novel P-glycoprotein gene, derived from SEQ ID NO: 1-8 (claim 2). However, the specification does not disclose how the molecules consisting essentially of SEQ ID NO: 9-16 are derived, nor the isolation of and assaying of molecules. There is no actual reduction to practice, sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural features, which are critical to activity, or complete detailed description of the function of claimed invention indicating that the claimed nucleic acids were indeed isolated, produced, and assayed for the uses disclosed. Likewise, the disclosure does not give sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural features, location of introns, exons, and open reading frames, chromosomal localization, or complete detailed description of the function of claimed genes indicating that the claimed gene was indeed isolated, produced, and assayed for the uses disclosed. Thus, one skilled in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the applicant was in possession of the invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Davis whose telephone number is 703-308-6410. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5:30 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa PhD can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4315 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.


Application/Control Number: 09/873,409

Page 6

Art Unit: 1642

Natalie A. Davis, PhD

May 4, 2002



ANTHONY C. CAPUTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600